Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/671,012	TERAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert C. Scheibel	2666	
All Participants:	Status of Application:	<u>`</u>	
(1) Robert C. Scheibel.	(3) Michael Casey.		
(2) <u>Eckhard Kuesters</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 6 January 2004	Time: <u>4:50 PM EST</u>		
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed: 1-2, 12-13, 16, 21-23  Prior art documents discussed:			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary</li> </ul>	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the interview, since	e substance
Polit ( Shill 1-10-05			
	Applicant's Representative Signature	gnature – if appro	opriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed a few minor changes to the claims to make the language clearer. Mr. Kuesters is going to fax the proposed changes to the client and respond with their comments as soon as possible. Mr. Kuesters consulted with his client and indicated that the changes discussed were authorized by the client in a voice mail message on January 7, 2005 at 1:30 PM EST. Mr. Kuesters requested that these changes be made via an examiner's amendment. Spoke with Mr. Casey on January 10, 2005 about a few additional claims documented in the examiner's amendment. Mr. Casey agreed to the proposed minor changes.